arXiv:1609.06832v1 [math.CO] 22 Sep 2016

Pre-adjunctions and the Ramsey property

Dragan Mašulović
University of Novi Sad, Faculty of Sciences
Department of Mathematics and Informatics
Trg Dositeja Obradovića 3, 21000 Novi Sad, Serbia
e-mail: dragan.masulovic@dmi.uns.ac.rs

September 23, 2016

Abstract

Showing that the Ramsey property holds for a class of finite structures can be an extremely challenging task and a slew of sophisticated methods have been proposed in literature.

In this paper we propose a new strategy to show that a class of structures has the Ramsey property. The strategy is based on a relatively simple result in category theory and consists of establishing a *pre-adjunction* between the category of structures which is known to have the Ramsey property, and the category of structures we are interested in. This strategy was implicitly used already in 1981 by H. J. Prömel and B. Voigt in their proof of the Ramsey property for the class of finite linearly ordered graphs.

We demonstrate the applicability of this strategy by providing short proofs of three important well known results: we show the Ramsey property for the category of all finite linearly ordered posets with embeddings, for the category of finite convexly ordered ultrametric spaces with embeddings, and for the category of all finite linearly ordered metric spaces (rational metric spaces) with embeddings.

Key Words: Ramsey property, pre-adjunctions
AMS Subj. Classification (2010): 05C55, 18A99

1 Introduction

Generalizing the classical results of F. P. Ramsey from the late 1920's, the structural Ramsey theory originated at the beginning of 1970s in a series of papers (see [12] for references). We say that a class $\mathbf{K}$ of finite structures

has the *Ramsey property* (RP) if the following holds: for any number $k \geqslant 2$ of colors and all $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $\mathcal{A}$ embeds into $\mathcal{B}$ there is a $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbf{K}$ such that no matter how we color the copies of $\mathcal{A}$ in $\mathcal{C}$ with k colors, there is a *monochromatic* copy $\mathcal{B}'$ of $\mathcal{B}$ in $\mathcal{C}$ (that is, all the copies of $\mathcal{A}$ that fall within $\mathcal{B}'$ are colored by the same color).

Showing that the Ramsey property holds for a class of finite structures $\mathbf{K}$ can be an extremely challenging task and a slew of sophisticated methods have been proposed in literature. These methods are usually constructive: given $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathbf{K}$ and $k \geqslant 2$ they prove the Ramsey property directly by constructing a structure $\mathcal{C} \in \mathbf{K}$ with the desired properties.

It was Leeb who pointed out in 1970 [9] that the use of category theory can be quite helpful both in the formulation and in the proofs of results pertaining to structural Ramsey theory. Instead of pursuing the original approach by Leeb (which has very fruitfully been applied to a wide range of Ramsey problems [9, 15, 4]) we proposed in [10] a systematic study of a simpler approach motivated by and implicit in [21, 23, 11]. We have shown in [10] that the Ramsey property is a genuine categorical property since it is preserved by categorical equivalence. Moreover, right adjoints preserve the Ramsey property while left adjoins preserve the dual Ramsey property (see [10] for details). In Section 2 we give a brief overview of standard notions refering to first order structures and category theory, and conclude with the reinterpretation of the Ramsey property in the language of category theory.

In this paper we propose a new strategy to show that a class of structures has the Ramsey property. The strategy is based on a relatively simple result in category theory and consists of establishing a *pre-adjunction* between the category of structures which is known to have the Ramsey property, and the category of structures we are interested in.

There have been many attempts to weaken the notion of adjunction (see [3, 22]) as adjoint situations are extremely important not only in category theory but other mathematical theories such as linear algebra and operator theory. The version that we focus on in this paper will be referred to as a *pre-adjunction* and is defined in Section 3. The main technical result in this paper is Theorem 3.2 which shows that "right pre-adjoints" preserve the Ramsey property. This is another confirmation of the fact that the Ramsey property is an extremely robust categorical property.

Since pre-adjunctions represent rather loose relationships between categories, establishing a pre-adjunction turns out to be much easier than establishing an adjunction or a categorical equivalence between two categories. Thus, it turns out that Theorem 3.2 has a practical consequence: it offers a "piggyback" strategy of proving that a category has the Ramsey property.

This strategy was implicitly used already in 1981 in [19] where the Ramsey property for finite linearly ordered graphs was shown as a consequence of the Graham-Rothschild Theorem (see also [17, Theorem 12.13]). In Section 4 we demonstrate the applicability of the strategy based on pre-adjunctions by providing short proofs of three important well known results. We first provide a straightforward proof of the Ramsey property for the category $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}$ of all finite linearly ordered posets with embeddings by establishing a pre-adjunction with the Graham-Rothschild category $\mathbf{GR}(\{0\}, X)$ (see Example 2.3 for the definition of the Graham-Rothschild category, and [16] for the original proof that the class of linearly ordered posets has the Ramsey property). As ultrametric spaces are intimately related to posets (trees, actually), it comes as no surprise that in the next step we provide a new proof that the category $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}$ of finite convexly ordered ultrametric spaces with embeddings has the Ramsey property (see [20] for the original proof). In order to do so we establish a pre-adjunction between the category $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}$ and a family of full subcategories of $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}$ which covers the entire $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}$. This idea can then be modified so as to provide a new proof of the fact that the categories $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}$ and $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ of all finite linearly ordered metric spaces with embeddings, resp. all finite linearly ordered rational metric spaces with embeddings, have the Ramsey property (see [14] for the original proof).

2 Preliminaries

In order to fix notation and terminology in this section we give a brief overview of standard notions refering to first order structures and category theory, and conclude with the reinterpretation of the Ramsey property in the language of category theory. For a systematic treatment of category-theoretic notions we refer the reader to [2].

2.1 Structures

A *structure* $\mathcal{A} = (A, \Delta)$ is a set A together with a set Δ of functions and relations on A, each having some finite arity. The underlying set of a structure $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{A}_1$, $\mathcal{A}^*$, ... will always be denoted by its roman letter A, A_1, A^*, ... respectively. A structure $\mathcal{A} = (A, \Delta)$ is *finite* if A is a finite set.

An *embedding* $f : \mathcal{A} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is an injection $f : A \to B$ which respects the functions in Δ, and respects and reflects the relations in Δ. Surjective embeddings are *isomorphisms*. We write $\mathcal{A} \cong \mathcal{B}$ to denote that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are isomorphic, and $\mathcal{A} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}$ to denote that there is an embedding of $\mathcal{A}$ into $\mathcal{B}$.

A structure $\mathcal{A}$ is a *substructure* of a structure $\mathcal{B}$ ($\mathcal{A} \leqslant \mathcal{B}$) if the identity map is an embedding of $\mathcal{A}$ into $\mathcal{B}$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a structure and $\varnothing \neq B \subseteq A$. Then $\mathcal{A}{\restriction_B} = (B, \Delta{\restriction_B})$ denotes the *substructure of* $\mathcal{A}$ *induced by* B, where $\Delta{\restriction_B}$ denotes the restriction of Δ to B. Note that $\mathcal{A}{\restriction_B}$ is not required to exist for every $B \subseteq A$. For example, if Δ contains functions, only those B which are closed with respect to all the functions in Δ qualify for the base set of a substructure.

Example 2.1 (a) A *linearly ordered graph* is a structure $\mathcal{G} = (V, E, <)$ where V is the set of vertices, $E \subseteq \big\{\{x, y\} : x, y \in V; x \neq y\big\}$ is the set of edges of $\mathcal{G}$, and $<$ is a linear order on V.

(b) A *linearly ordered poset* is a structure $\mathcal{A} = (A, \sqsubseteq, <)$ where $(A, \sqsubseteq)$ is a poset and $<$ is a linear order on A which extends $\sqsubseteq$ (that is, if $a \sqsubseteq b$ and $a \neq b$ then $a < b$).

(c) A *linearly ordered metric space* is a structure $\mathcal{M} = (M, d, <)$ where $d : M^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is a *metric* and $<$ is a linear order on M. A linearly ordered matric space $(M, d, <)$ is *rational* if $d : M^2 \to \mathbb{Q}$,

(d) A *convexly ordered ultrametric space* is a structure $\mathcal{U} = (U, d, <)$ where $d : U^2 \to \mathbb{R}$ is an *ultrametric* (that is, a metric satisfying $d(x, z) \leqslant \max\{d(x, y), d(y, z)\}$), and $<$ is a linear order on U such that every ball in $\mathcal{U}$ is convex with respect to $<$ (in other words, if $x, y \in B(u, r)$ and $x < z < y$ then $z \in B(u, r)$).

Let $\mathcal{L} = (L, <)$ be a finite linearly ordered set. For a nonempty $X \subseteq L$ let $\min_{\mathcal{L}}(X)$, resp. $\max_{\mathcal{L}}(X)$, denote the minimum, resp. maximum, of X in $\mathcal{L}$. As a convention we let $\min_{\mathcal{L}} \varnothing =$ the top element of $\mathcal{L}$, and $\max_{\mathcal{L}} \varnothing =$ the bottom element of $\mathcal{L}$.

Let $<_{lex}$, $<_{alex}$ and $<_{\overline{lex}}$ denote the *lexicographic*, *anti-lexicographic* and *complemented lexicographic* ordering on $\mathcal{P}(L)$, respectively, defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
A <_{lex} B \text{ iff } A \subset B, \text{ or } & \min_{\mathcal{L}}(B \setminus A) < \min_{\mathcal{L}}(A \setminus B) \text{ in case} \\
& A \text{ and } B \text{ are incomparable;} \\
A <_{alex} B \text{ iff } A \subset B, \text{ or } & \max_{\mathcal{L}}(A \setminus B) < \max_{\mathcal{L}}(B \setminus A) \text{ in case} \\
& A \text{ and } B \text{ are incomparable;} \\
A <_{\overline{lex}} B \text{ iff } A \supset B, \text{ or } & \min_{\mathcal{L}}(A \setminus B) < \min_{\mathcal{L}}(B \setminus A) \text{ in case} \\
& A \text{ and } B \text{ are incomparable.}
\end{aligned}$$

(Note that $A <_{\overline{lex}} B$ iff $L \setminus A <_{lex} L \setminus B$, hence the name.)

For $k \geqslant 1$ let $<_{lex}$ and $<_{alex}$ denote the *lexicographic* and *anti-lexicographic* ordering on L^k, respectively, defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}(a_1,\ldots,a_k) <_{lex} (b_1,\ldots,b_k) \text{ iff there is an } i \text{ such that } a_i < b_i \\ \text{and } a_j = b_j \text{ for all } j < i,\\ (a_1,\ldots,a_k) <_{alex} (b_1,\ldots,b_k) \text{ iff there is an } i \text{ such that } a_i < b_i \\ \text{and } a_j = b_j \text{ for all } j > i.\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that all these are linear orders on $\mathcal{P}(L)$ and L^k, respectively.

2.2 Categories and functors

In order to specify a *category* $\mathbf{C}$ one has to specify a class of objects $\mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{C})$, a set of morphisms $\hom_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$ for all $\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{C})$, an identity morphism $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}$ for all $\mathcal{A} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{C})$, and the composition of morphisms $\cdot$ so that $(f\cdot g)\cdot h = f\cdot(g\cdot h)$, and $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}}\cdot f = f\cdot \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}$ for all $f \in \hom_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$. Instead of $\hom_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$ we write $\hom(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$ whenever $\mathbf{C}$ is obvious from the context.

Let $\mathbf{C}$ be a category. Every class $\mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{C})$ can be turned into a category by letting $\hom_{\mathbf{K}}(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}) = \hom_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B})$ $(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B} \in \mathbf{K})$ and $f \cdot_{\mathbf{K}} g = f \cdot_{\mathbf{C}} g$. We say then that $\mathbf{K}$ is a *full subcategory* of $\mathbf{C}$.

Example 2.2 Structures and some appropriately chosen morphisms usually constitute a category. For example, all finite linearly ordered graphs with embeddings constitute a category which we denote with $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{G}}$; all finite linearly ordered posets with embeddings constitute a category which we denote with $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}$; all finite linearly ordered metric spaces with embeddings constitute a category which we denote with $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}$; and all finite convexly ordered ultrametric spaces with embeddings constitute a category which we denote with $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}$.

For a linearly ordered metric space $\mathcal{M} = (M,d,<)$ let

$$\mathrm{spec}(\mathcal{M}) = \{d(x,y) : x,y \in M\}$$

denote the *spectre* of $\mathcal{M}$, that is, the set of all the distances that are attained by points in $\mathcal{M}$. For a nonempty finite $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ of nonnegative reals let $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_S$ denote the full subcategory of $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}$ spanned by all those $\mathcal{M} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}})$ satisfying $\mathrm{spec}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq S$, and let $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}_S$ denote the full subcategory of $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}$ spanned by all those $\mathcal{U} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}})$ satisfying $\mathrm{spec}(\mathcal{U}) \subseteq S$.

Example 2.3 Let us now specify a category where objects are not structures and morphisms are not structure preserving maps. This category will be of particular importance in the sequel.

Let A be a finite alphabet. A word u of length n over A can be thought of as an element of A^n but also as a mapping $u : \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} \to A$. In the latter case $u^{-1}(a)$, $a \in A$, denotes the set of all the positions in u where a appears.

Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots\}$ be a countably infinite set of variables and let A be a finite alphabet disjoint from X. An *m-parameter word over A of length n* is a word $w \in (A \cup \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m\})^n$ satisfying the following:

- each of the letters $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ appears at least once in w, and
- $\min(w^{-1}(x_i)) < \min(w^{-1}(x_j))$ whenever $1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant m$.

Let $W_m^n(A)$ denote the set of all the m-parameter words over A of length n. For $u \in W_m^n(A)$ and $v = v_1 v_2 \ldots v_m \in W_k^m(A)$ let

$$u \cdot v = u[v_1/x_1, v_2/x_2, \ldots, v_m/x_m] \in W_k^n(A)$$

denote the word obtained by replacing each occurence of x_i in u with v_i, simultaneously for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$.

Let $\mathbf{GR}(A, X)$ denote the *Graham-Rothschild category over A and X* whose objects are positive integers 1, 2, ..., whose morphisms are given by $\hom(k, n) = W_k^n(A)$ if $k \leqslant n$ and $\hom(k, n) = \varnothing$ if $k > n$, where the composition is $\cdot$ defined above and the identity morphism id_n is given by $x_1 x_2 \ldots x_n$.

A *functor* $F : \mathbf{C} \to \mathbf{D}$ from a category $\mathbf{C}$ to a category $\mathbf{D}$ maps $\mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{C})$ to $\mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{D})$ and maps morphisms of $\mathbf{C}$ to morphisms of $\mathbf{D}$ so that $F(f) \in \hom_{\mathbf{D}}(F(\mathcal{A}), F(\mathcal{B}))$ whenever $f \in \hom_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, $F(f \cdot g) = F(f) \cdot F(g)$ whenever $f \cdot g$ is defined, and $F(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}) = \mathrm{id}_{F(\mathcal{A})}$. A pair of functors $F : \mathbf{D} \rightleftarrows \mathbf{C} : G$ is an *adjunction* provided there is a family of isomorphisms $\Phi_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{X}} : \hom_{\mathbf{C}}(F(\mathcal{Y}), \mathcal{X}) \cong \hom_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathcal{Y}, G(\mathcal{X}))$ indexed by pairs $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{X}) \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{D}) \times \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{C})$ which is natural in both $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$. We say that F is *left adjoint* to G and G is *right adjoint* to F. (For the full definition of adjunction the reader is referred to [2].)

2.3 Structural Ramsey property in the language of category theory

Let $\mathbf{C}$ be a category and $\mathcal{S}$ a set. We say that $\mathcal{S} = \Sigma_1 \cup \ldots \cup \Sigma_k$ is a *k-coloring* of $\mathcal{S}$ if $\Sigma_i \cap \Sigma_j = \varnothing$ whenever $i \neq j$. For an integer $k \geqslant 2$ and

$\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{C})$ we write $\mathcal{C} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{B})^{\mathcal{A}}_k$ to denote that for every k-coloring $\hom_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}) = \Sigma_1 \cup \ldots \cup \Sigma_k$ there is an $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ and a morphism $w \in \hom_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C})$ such that $w \cdot \hom_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \subseteq \Sigma_i$.

A category $\mathbf{C}$ has the *Ramsey property* if for every integer $k \geqslant 2$ and all $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{C})$ such that $\hom_{\mathbf{C}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \neq \varnothing$ there is a $\mathcal{C} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{C})$ such that $\mathcal{C} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{B})^{\mathcal{A}}_k$.

Example 2.4 The categories $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{G}}$, $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}$, $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}$, $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}$ have the Ramsey property. Note that this is just a reformulation of the well known results proved in [1, 15], [16], [14], [14] and [20], respectively.

For every finite set A and a countably infinite set $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots\}$ disjoint from A the Graham-Rothschild category $\mathbf{GR}(A, X)$ has the Ramsey property. This is just a reformulation of the famous Graham-Rothschild Theorem:

Theorem 2.1 *[5] Let A be a finite alphabet and let $m, \ell \geqslant 1$ and $k \geqslant 2$. Then there exists an n such that for every partition $W^n_\ell(A) = \Sigma_1 \cup \ldots \cup \Sigma_k$ there exist a $u \in W^n_m(A)$ and j such that $\{u \cdot v : v \in W^m_\ell(A)\} \subseteq \Sigma_j$.*

3 The Ramsey property and pre-adjunctions

There have been many attempts to weaken the notion of adjunction [3, 22]. In this paper we consider the following version that we refer to as a pre-adjunction.

Definition 3.1 Let $\mathbf{C}$ and $\mathbf{D}$ be categories. A pair of maps

$$F : \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{D}) \rightleftarrows \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{C}) : G$$

is a *pre-adjunction between* $\mathbf{C}$ *and* $\mathbf{D}$ provided there is a family of maps

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{X}} : \hom_{\mathbf{C}}(F(\mathcal{Y}), \mathcal{X}) \to \hom_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathcal{Y}, G(\mathcal{X}))$$

indexed by pairs $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{X}) \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{D}) \times \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{C})$ such that the following holds:

(PA) for every $\mathcal{C} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{C})$, every $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{D})$, every $u \in \hom_{\mathbf{C}}(F(\mathcal{D}), \mathcal{C})$ and every $f \in \hom_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D})$ there is a $v \in \hom_{\mathbf{C}}(F(\mathcal{E}), F(\mathcal{D}))$ satisfying $\Phi_{\mathcal{D},\mathcal{C}}(u) \cdot f = \Phi_{\mathcal{E},\mathcal{C}}(u \cdot v)$.



(Note that in a pre-adjunction F and G are *not* required to be functors, just maps from the class of objects of one of the two categories into the class of objects of the other category; also Φ is not required to be a natural isomorphism, just a family of maps between hom-sets satisfying the requirement above.)

Theorem 3.2 *Let* $\mathbf{C}$ *and* $\mathbf{D}$ *be categories and let* $F : \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{D}) \rightleftarrows \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{C}) : G$ *be a pre-adjunction with* $\Phi_{\mathcal{Y},\mathcal{X}} : \hom_{\mathbf{C}}(F(\mathcal{Y}), \mathcal{X}) \to \hom_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathcal{Y}, G(\mathcal{X}))$ *as the corresponding family of maps between hom-sets. Assume that* $\mathbf{C}$ *has the Ramsey property. Then* $\mathbf{D}$ *has the Ramsey property.*

Proof. Take any $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{D})$ and an integer $k \geqslant 2$. Since $\mathbf{C}$ has the Ramsey property, there is a $\mathcal{C} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{C})$ such that $\mathcal{C} \longrightarrow (F(\mathcal{D}))^{F(\mathcal{E})}_k$. Let us show that $G(\mathcal{C}) \longrightarrow (\mathcal{D})^{\mathcal{E}}_k$. Take any coloring $\hom_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathcal{E}, G(\mathcal{C})) = \Sigma_1 \cup \ldots \cup \Sigma_k$ and construct a coloring $\hom_{\mathbf{C}}(F(\mathcal{E}), \mathcal{C}) = \Sigma'_1 \cup \ldots \cup \Sigma'_k$ as follows:

$$\Sigma'_i = \{u \in \hom_{\mathbf{C}}(F(\mathcal{E}), \mathcal{C}) : \Phi_{\mathcal{E},\mathcal{C}}(u) \in \Sigma_i\}. \tag{3.1}$$

By the choice of $\mathcal{C}$ there is a $u \in \hom_{\mathbf{C}}(F(\mathcal{D}), \mathcal{C})$ and a $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that

$$u \cdot \hom_{\mathbf{C}}(F(\mathcal{E}), F(\mathcal{D})) \subseteq \Sigma'_j. \tag{3.2}$$

Let us show that

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{D},\mathcal{C}}(u) \cdot \hom_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D}) \subseteq \Sigma_j. \tag{3.3}$$

Take any $f \in \hom_{\mathbf{D}}(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{D})$. Since $F : \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{D}) \rightleftarrows \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{C}) : G$ is a pre-adjunction, there is a $v \in \hom_{\mathbf{C}}(F(\mathcal{E}), F(\mathcal{D}))$ such that

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{D},\mathcal{C}}(u) \cdot f = \Phi_{\mathcal{E},\mathcal{C}}(u \cdot v). \tag{3.4}$$

By (3.2) we have that $u \cdot v \in \Sigma'_j$, so $\Phi_{\mathcal{E},\mathcal{C}}(u \cdot v) \in \Sigma_j$ by (3.1). This, together with (3.4) yields $\Phi_{\mathcal{D},\mathcal{C}}(u) \cdot f \in \Sigma_j$. □

This strategy of proving that a category of structures has the Ramsey property was implicitly used already in 1981 in [19] where the Ramsey property for finite linearly ordered graphs was proved as a consequence of the Graham-Rothschild Theorem (see also [17, Theorem 12.13]). We shall now provide a sketch of that proof in the new parlance introduced above.

Theorem 3.3 *The category* $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{G}}$ *has the Ramsey property.*

Proof. (Sketch, cf. [17, Theorem 12.13]) It suffices to show that there is a pre-adjunction

$$F : \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{G}}) \rightleftarrows \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{GR}(\{0\}, X)) : G,$$

where X is a countably infinite set of variables disjoint from $\{0\}$. The result then follows from Theorem 3.2 and the fact that the category $\mathbf{GR}(\{0\}, X)$ has the Ramsey property (Example 2.4).

For a $\mathcal{G} = (V, E, <) \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{G}})$ let $F(\mathcal{G}) = |V| + |E|$. On the other hand, for a positive integer n (recall that $\mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{GR}(A, X)) = \mathbb{N}$) let

$$G(n) = (\mathcal{P}(\{1, 2, \dots, n\}), E_n, <_{\overline{lex}})$$

denote the finite linearly ordered graph on $\mathcal{P}(\{1, 2, \dots, n\})$ where $\{X, Y\} \in E_n$ if and only if $X \cap Y \neq \varnothing$, and $<_{\overline{lex}}$ is the complemented lexicographic ordering of $\mathcal{P}(\{1, 2, \dots, N\})$ induced by the usual ordering of the integers.

For a finite linearly ordered graph $\mathcal{G}$ and a positive integer N define

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{G},N} : \hom_{\mathbf{GR}(\{0\},X)}(F(\mathcal{G}), N) \to \hom_{\overrightarrow{\mathbf{G}}}(\mathcal{G}, G(N))$$

as follows. Let $\mathcal{G} = (V, E, <)$, where $V = \{v_1 < \ldots < v_n\}$ and $E = \{e_1 <_{lex} \ldots <_{lex} e_m\}$. Take any $u \in \hom_{\mathbf{GR}(\{0\},X)}(n + m, N) = W^N_{n+m}(\{0\})$ and for every $i \in \{1, \dots, n + m\}$ let $X_i = u^{-1}(x_i)$. For $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ let

$$\tilde{v}_i = X_i \cup \bigcup_{j\,:\,e_j \ni v_i} X_{n+j}.$$

It is easy to see that $\hat{u} : \mathcal{G} \to G(N) : v_i \mapsto \tilde{v}_i$ is an embedding of linearly ordered graphs (note that, by construction, v_i and v_j are adjacent if and only if $\tilde{v}_i \cap \tilde{v}_j \neq \varnothing$), so we put $\Phi_{\mathcal{G},N}(u) = \hat{u}$.

Let $\mathcal{G}' = (V', E', <')$, where $V' = \{v'_1 <' \ldots <' v'_p\}$ and $E' = \{e'_1 <'_{lex} \ldots <'_{lex} e'_q\}$. Let $f : \mathcal{G}' \hookrightarrow \mathcal{G}$ be an embedding. For $j \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ let

$$X'_{p+j} = \hat{u}(f(v'_i)) \cap \hat{u}(f(v'_k)) \text{ where } e'_j = \{v'_i, v'_k\},$$

and then for $i \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ put

$$X'_i = \hat{u}(f(v'_i)) \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{q} X'_{p+j}.$$

Finally, define $h = h_1 h_2 \dots h_{n+m} \in \hom_{\mathbf{GR}(\{0\},X)}(p+q, n+m) = W^{n+m}_{p+q}(\{0\})$ as follows:

$$h_j = \begin{cases} x_i, & X_j \subseteq X'_i \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then it is a routine to check that $\Phi_{\mathcal{G},N}(u) \circ f = \Phi_{\mathcal{G}',N}(u \cdot h)$. □

4 Linearly ordered posets and metric spaces

In this section we apply the strategy based on pre-adjunctions to provide new straightforward proofs of three important well known results. We are first going to show that the category $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}$ of all finite linearly ordered posets with embeddings has the Ramsey property by establishing a pre-adjunction with the Graham-Rothschild category $\mathbf{GR}(\{0\}, X)$ (see [16] for the original proof).

We then provide a new proof that the category $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}$ of finite convexly ordered ultrametric spaces with embeddings has the Ramsey property (see [20] for the original proof). In order to do so we establish a pre-adjunction between the category $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}$ and a family of full subcategories of $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}$ which covers the entire $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}$.

This idea can then be modified so as to provide a new proof of the fact that the category $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ of all finite linearly ordered rational metric spaces with embeddings has the Ramsey property by establishing a pre-adjunction between the category $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}$ and a family of full subcategories of $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ which covers the entire $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ (see [14] for the original proof).

Theorem 4.1 *(cf. [16]) The category $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}$ has the Ramsey property.*

Proof. It suffices to show that there is a pre-adjunction

$$F : \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}) \rightleftarrows \mathrm{Ob}(\mathbf{GR}(\{0\}, X)) : G,$$

where X is a countably infinite set of variables disjoint from $\{0\}$. The result then follows from Theorem 3.2 and the fact that the category $\mathbf{GR}(\{0\}, X)$ has the Ramsey property (Example 2.4).

Recall that a *downset* in a finite linearly ordered poset $\mathcal{A} = (A, \sqsubseteq, <)$ is a subset $B \subseteq A$ such that $x \in B$ and $y \sqsubseteq x$ implies $y \in B$. For $a \in A$ let $\downarrow_{\mathcal{A}} a = \{b \in A : b \sqsubseteq a\}$. For an $\mathcal{A} = (A, \sqsubseteq, <) \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}})$ let $F(\mathcal{A}) =$ the number of distinct nonempty downsets in $(A, \sqsubseteq)$. On the other hand, for a positive integer n let $G(n) = \big(\mathcal{P}(\{1, \ldots, n\}), \supseteq, <_{\overline{lex}}\big)$. Clearly, $G(n)$ is a linearly ordered poset.

For a finite linearly ordered poset $\mathcal{A}$ and a positive integer n define

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{A},n} : \hom_{\mathbf{GR}(\{0\},X)}(F(\mathcal{A}), n) \to \hom_{\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}}(\mathcal{A}, G(n))$$

as follows. Let $\mathcal{A} = (\{1, 2, \ldots, k\}, \sqsubseteq, <)$ where $<$ is the usual ordering of the integers. Let $D_1, \ldots, D_m$ be all the nonempty downsets in $\mathcal{A}$ and let $D_1 <_{alex} D_2 <_{alex} \ldots <_{alex} D_m$. For $u \in \hom_{\mathbf{GR}(\{0\},X)}(F(\mathcal{A}), n) =$

$W^n_m(\{0\})$, let $X_i = u^{-1}(x_i)$, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant m$, and let $a_i = \bigcup\{X_\alpha : i \in D_\alpha\}$, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant k$. Put $\Phi_{\mathcal{A},n}(u) = \varphi_u$ where $\varphi_u : \mathcal{A} \to G(n) : i \mapsto a_i$.

To show that the definition of Φ is corect we have to show that for every $u \in W^n_m(\{0\})$ the mapping φ_u is an embedding $\mathcal{A} \hookrightarrow G(n)$.

Let us first show that $i \sqsubseteq j$ implies $a_i \supseteq a_j$. Recall that $a_i = \bigcup\{X_\alpha : i \in D_\alpha\}$ and $a_j = \bigcup\{X_\beta : j \in D_\beta\}$. Take any $X_\beta \subseteq a_j$. Then $j \in D_\beta$ so $i \sqsubseteq j$ and the fact that D_β is a downset imply $i \in D_\beta$. Therefore, $X_\beta \subseteq a_i$.

Assume, next, that i and j are $\sqsubseteq$-incomparable in $\mathcal{A}$ and let us show that a_i and a_j are incomparable as sets. Let $\downarrow_{\mathcal{A}} i = D_\alpha$ and $\downarrow_{\mathcal{A}} j = D_\beta$. Since $X_1, \ldots, X_m$ are pairwise disjoint we have that $i \in D_\alpha$ and $i \notin D_\beta$ imply $X_\alpha \subseteq a_i$ and $X_\alpha \not\subseteq a_j$. Analogously, $j \notin D_\alpha$ and $j \in D_\beta$ imply $X_\beta \not\subseteq a_i$ and $X_\beta \subseteq a_j$. Therefore, a_i and a_j are incomparable.

Finally, let us show that $i < j$ implies $a_i <_{\overline{lex}} a_j$. Assume that $i < j$ and $u = u_1u_2 \ldots u_n$. If $i \sqsubseteq j$ then, as we have just seen, $a_i \supseteq a_j$, so $a_i <_{\overline{lex}} a_j$ because $<_{\overline{lex}}$ extends $\supseteq$. Assume, therefore, that $i \not\sqsubseteq j$. Then i and j are incomparable in $\mathcal{A}$, whence follows that a_i and a_j are incomparable as sets (previous paragraph). Seeking a contradiction, assume that $a_j <_{\overline{lex}} a_i$. Then $s := \min(a_j \setminus a_i) < \min(a_i \setminus a_j)$. Since $s \in a_j$ then there is a q such that $s \in X_q$ and $j \in D_q$. Note that $s \in X_q$ means that $u_s = x_q$. Let $\downarrow_{\mathcal{A}} i = D_p$. Clearly we have that $\max(D_p) = i$ and $X_p \subseteq a_i$. From $\max(D_p) = i < j \in D_q$ we easily conclude that $D_p <_{alex} D_q$, whence $p < q$. Therefore, $t := \min(u^{-1}(x_p)) < \min(u^{-1}(x_q)) \leqslant s$ (because $u_s = x_q$). From $u_t = x_p$ it follows that $t \in X_p \subseteq a_i$. Next, we note that $t \in a_j$ (if $t \notin a_j$ then $\min(a_i \setminus a_j) \leqslant t$ so $s = \min(a_j \setminus a_i) < \min(a_i \setminus a_j) \leqslant t$ contradicts $t < s$). Since $X_1, \ldots, X_m$ are pairwise disjoint it follows that $t \in X_p \subseteq a_j$, whence $j \in D_p = \downarrow_{\mathcal{A}} i$, so $j \sqsubseteq i$. Contradiction.

So, the definition of Φ is correct. We still have to show that this family of maps satisfies the requirement (PA) of Definition 3.1.

Let $\mathcal{B} = (\{1, 2, \ldots, \ell\}, \sqsubseteq, <)$ be a linearly ordered poset that embeds into $\mathcal{A}$. Let $D'_1, \ldots, D'_d$ be all the nonempty downsets in $\mathcal{B}$ and let $D'_1 <_{alex} D'_2 <_{alex} \ldots <_{alex} D'_d$. Take any embedding $f : \mathcal{B} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ and let us show that there is a word $h = h_1h_2 \ldots h_m \in W^m_d(\{0\})$ such that $\Phi_{\mathcal{A},n}(u) \circ f = \Phi_{\mathcal{B},n}(u \cdot h)$.

Define $h = h_1h_2 \ldots h_m \in W^m_d(\{0\})$ as follows:

$$h_i = \begin{cases} x_j, & f^{-1}(D_i) = D'_j \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let us first show that h is indeed a d-parameter word. Since every downset in $\mathcal{B}$ is an inverse image of a downset in $\mathcal{A}$ (for every j, $D'_j = f^{-1}(D_i)$ where

$D_i = \downarrow_{\mathcal{A}} f(D'_j))$, each of the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_d$ appears at least once in h. Let us show that $\min(h^{-1}(x_\alpha)) < \min(h^{-1}(x_\beta))$ whenever $1 \leqslant \alpha < \beta \leqslant d$. Take α, β such that $1 \leqslant \alpha < \beta \leqslant d$ and let $\min(h^{-1}(x_\beta)) = q$. Since $h_q = x_\beta$ we know that $f^{-1}(D_q) = D'_\beta$. Take p so that $D'_\alpha = f^{-1}(D_p)$. Then $h_p = x_\alpha$. If $p < q$ then $\min(h^{-1}(x_\alpha)) \leqslant p < q = \min(h^{-1}(x_\beta))$ and we are done. Assume, therefore, that $p > q$. So, we have that $D_p >_{alex} D_q$ (because $p > q$) and $f^{-1}(D_p) <_{alex} f^{-1}(D_q)$ (because $\alpha < \beta$ whence $f^{-1}(D_p) = D'_\alpha <_{alex} D'_\beta = f^{-1}(D_q)$).

Claim. There exists a D_r such that $D_r <_{alex} D_q$ and $f^{-1}(D_r) = f^{-1}(D_p)$.

Proof. Let $D_r = \downarrow_{\mathcal{A}} f(f^{-1}(D_p))$. It is easy to show that $f^{-1}(D_r) = f^{-1}(D_p)$. Let us show that $D_r <_{alex} D_q$. We know that $f^{-1}(D_p) <_{alex} f^{-1}(D_q)$, so $f(f^{-1}(D_p)) <_{alex} f(f^{-1}(D_q))$. Since $f(f^{-1}(D_q)) \subseteq D_q$ it follows that $f(f^{-1}(D_q)) <_{alex} D_q$ (as $<_{alex}$ extends $\subseteq$). Therefore, $f(f^{-1}(D_p)) <_{alex} D_q$. Finally, $D_r = \downarrow_{\mathcal{A}} f(f^{-1}(D_p)) <_{alex} \downarrow_{\mathcal{A}} D_q = D_q$ (because D_q is a downset). This concludes the proof of the claim.

Now, $D_r <_{alex} D_q$ implies that $r < q$, while $f^{-1}(D_r) = f^{-1}(D_p) = D'_\alpha$ means that $h_r = x_\alpha$. Therefore, $\min(h^{-1}(x_\alpha)) \leqslant r < q = \min(h^{-1}(x_\beta))$, which completes the proof that h is a d-parameter word.

Let $X'_i = (u \cdot h)^{-1}(x_i)$, $1 \leqslant i \leqslant d$, and $a'_j = \bigcup\{X'_\beta : j \in D'_\beta\}$, $1 \leqslant j \leqslant |B|$. The following is a strightforward but useful observation: if $h^{-1}(x_\beta) = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_s\}$ then $D'_\beta = f^{-1}(D_{\alpha_1}) = \ldots = f^{-1}(D_{\alpha_s})$ and $X'_\beta = (u \cdot h)^{-1}(x_\beta) = u^{-1}(x_{\alpha_1}) \cup \ldots \cup u^{-1}(x_{\alpha_s}) = X_{\alpha_1} \cup \ldots \cup X_{\alpha_s}$.

In order to complete the proof it suffices to show that $a'_j = a_{f(j)}$ for all $1 \leqslant j \leqslant |B|$.

($\subseteq$): Take any $X'_\beta \subseteq a'_j$. Then $j \in D'_\beta$. Let $h^{-1}(x_\beta) = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_s\}$. Then $D'_\beta = f^{-1}(D_{\alpha_1}) = \ldots = f^{-1}(D_{\alpha_s})$, whence $j \in f^{-1}(D_{\alpha_i})$ for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant s$. Consequently, $f(j) \in D_{\alpha_i}$ for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant s$, so $X_{\alpha_i} \subseteq a_{f(j)}$ for all $1 \leqslant i \leqslant s$. Finally, $X'_\beta = X_{\alpha_1} \cup \ldots \cup X_{\alpha_s} \subseteq a_{f(j)}$.

($\supseteq$): Take any $X_\alpha \subseteq a_{f(j)}$. Then $f(j) \in D_\alpha$ whence $j \in f^{-1}(D_\alpha) = D'_\beta$ so $X'_\beta \subseteq a'_j$. By the definition of h we have that $h_\alpha = x_\beta$ whence $X_\alpha \subseteq X'_\beta$. Therefore, $X_\alpha \subseteq a'_j$. □

Theorem 4.2 *[20] The category $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}_S$ has the Ramsey property for every set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ of nonnegative reals. Consequently, the category $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}$ has the Ramsey property.*

Proof. In order to show that $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}_S$ has the Ramsey property for every set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ of nonnegative reals it suffices to show that the category $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}_{S'}$ has the Ramsey property for every finite set $S' \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ of nonnegative reals. Namely, assume that $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}_{S'}$ has the Ramsey property for every finite S'. Take any set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ of nonnegative reals, any $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}_S)$ such that $\mathcal{U} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}$, and any $k \geqslant 2$. Since $\mathcal{V}$ is finite, $S' = \mathrm{spec}(\mathcal{V})$ is a finite subset of S and $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}_{S'})$ because $\mathrm{spec}(\mathcal{U}) \subseteq \mathrm{spec}(\mathcal{V})$. The category $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}_{S'}$ has the Ramsey property by the assumption, so there is a $\mathcal{W} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}_{S'})$ such that $\mathcal{W} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{V})^{\mathcal{U}}_k$. But $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}_{S'}$ is a subcategory of $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}_S$, whence $\mathcal{W} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}_S)$.

Now, take any *finite* set $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ of nonnegative reals. In order to show that $\mathcal{U}(S)$ has the Ramsey property it suffices to establish a pre-adjunction

$$F : \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}_S) \rightleftarrows \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}) : G$$

since $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}$ has the Ramsey property (Theorem 3.2).

Let us construct one such pre-adjunction. Let $S = \{0 = s_0 < s_1 < \ldots < s_k\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. For $\mathcal{U} = (U, d, <) \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}_S)$ put $B_{\mathcal{U}} = \{B(x, s) : x \in U, s \in S\}$ where $B(x, s) = \{y \in U : d(x, y) \leqslant s\}$. Let us order the balls in $B_{\mathcal{U}}$ as follows:

$$B(x, s_i) \prec B(y, s_j) \text{ if and only if } s_i < s_j, \text{ or } s_i = s_j \text{ and } x < y.$$

Note that $\prec$ is a linear ordering of $B_{\mathcal{U}}$ because in an ultrametric space every point in a ball can serve as the center of the ball, and because $\mathcal{U}$ is a convexly ordered ultrametric space. Now let

$$F(\mathcal{U}) = (B_{\mathcal{U}}, \subseteq, \prec).$$

Clearly, $(B_{\mathcal{U}}, \subseteq)$ is a poset, and we have just seen that $\prec$ is a linear ordering of $B_{\mathcal{U}}$. It is easy to see that $\prec$ extends $\subseteq$: if $B(x, s_i) \subset B(y, s_j)$ then $s_i < s_j$ whence $B(x, s_i) \prec B(y, s_j)$. Therefore, $(B_{\mathcal{U}}, \subseteq, \prec)$ is a finite linearly ordered poset and the definition of F is correct.

For $\mathcal{A} = (A, \sqsubseteq, \prec) \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}})$ put

$$A^{<k} = \{(a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{k-1}) : a_i \in A, 0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1\}.$$

(By this notation we want to stress that the tuples in $A^{<k}$ are indexed by $0, 1, \ldots, k-1$.) Tuples $(a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{k-1}), (b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_{k-1}), \ldots \in A^{<k}$ will be abbreviated as $\overline{a}$, $\overline{b}$, ..., respectively. Define $d_{\mathcal{A}} : (A^{<k})^2 \to S$ by $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{b}) = s_j$ where

$$j = \min\{p \in \{0, 1, \ldots, k-1\} : (\forall i \geqslant p) a_i = b_i\},$$

and we assume that $\min \varnothing = k$. Next, put $\overline{a} \prec_{alex} \overline{b}$ if and only if there is a j such that $a_j \prec b_j$ and $(\forall i > j) a_i = b_i$. Finally, let

$$G(\mathcal{A}) = (A^{<k}, d_{\mathcal{A}}, \prec_{alex}).$$

Claim. $(A^{<k}, d_{\mathcal{A}}, \prec_{alex})$ is a convexly ordered ultrametric space with distances in S.

Proof. It is clear that $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{b}) \in S$ for all $\overline{a}, \overline{b} \in A^{<k}$ and that $\prec_{alex}$ is a linear ordering of $A^{<k}$. In order to show that $d_{\mathcal{A}}$ is an ultrametric we will just demostrate the triangle inequality, as the other axioms are obvious. Take any $\overline{a}, \overline{b}, \overline{c} \in A^{<k}$ and let us show that $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{c}) \leqslant \max\{d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{b}), d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{b}, \overline{c})\}$. If $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{b}) = s_k$ or $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{b}, \overline{c}) = s_k$ the inequality is trivially true. Assume, therefore, that $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{b}) = s_i < s_k$ and $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{b}, \overline{c}) = s_j < s_k$. If $i \geqslant j$ then $a_\ell = b_\ell = c_\ell$ for $\ell \geqslant i$ whence $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{c}) \leqslant s_i = \max\{s_i, s_j\}$. The case $i < j$ is analogous.

It still remains to be shown that every ball in $(A^{<k}, d_{\mathcal{A}})$ is convex with respect to $\prec_{alex}$. Let β be a ball in $(A^{<k}, d_{\mathcal{A}})$. Take any $\overline{a}, \overline{b} \in \beta$ and a $\overline{c} \in A^{<k}$ such that $\overline{a} \prec_{alex} \overline{c} \prec_{alex} \overline{b}$. Let $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{b}) = s_i$.

If $s_i = s_k$ then $A^{<k} = B(\overline{a}, s_i) = \beta$ so $\overline{c} \in \beta$ trivially. Assume, therefore, that $s_i < s_k$. From $\overline{a} \prec_{alex} \overline{c}$ it follows that there is a t such that $a_t \prec c_t$ and $a_j = c_j$ for all $j > t$. Let us show that $t < i$. Suppose, to the contrary, that $t \geqslant i$. Then $a_j = c_j = b_j$ for $j > t$. Since $a_t \prec c_t$ and $a_t = b_t$, it follows that $b_t \prec c_t$. Therefore, $\overline{b} \prec_{alex} \overline{c}$. Contradiction. So, $t < i$.

Now, from $t < i$ it follows that $a_j = c_j$ for $j \geqslant i$, whence $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{c}) \leqslant s_i$. Therefore, $\overline{c} \in B(\overline{a}, s_i) \subseteq \beta$. This completes the proof of the claim.

For $\mathcal{U} = (U, d, <) \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}_S)$ and $\mathcal{A} = (A, \sqsubseteq, \prec) \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}})$ let us define

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{A}} : \hom_{\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}}(F(\mathcal{U}), \mathcal{A}) \to \hom_{\overrightarrow{\mathbf{U}}_S}(\mathcal{U}, G(\mathcal{A}))$$

as follows. For $u : F(\mathcal{U}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ let $\hat{u} = \Phi_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{A}}(u) : U \to A^{<k}$ be defined by

$$\hat{u}(x) = (u(B(x, s_0)), u(B(x, s_1)), \ldots, u(B(x, s_{k-1}))).$$

To show that the definition of Φ is corect we have to show that for every $u : F(\mathcal{U}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ the mapping $\hat{u}$ is an embedding $\mathcal{U} \hookrightarrow G(\mathcal{A})$.

To start with, note that $\hat{u}$ is injective: if $\hat{u}(x) = \hat{u}(y)$ then $u(B(x, s_0)) = u(B(y, s_0))$, whence $x = y$ having in mind that u is injective and that $s_0 = 0$.

It easy to show that $d(x, y) = d_{\mathcal{A}}(\hat{u}(x), \hat{u}(y))$. Let $d(x, y) = s_i$. Then $B(x, s_j) = B(y, s_j)$ for all $j \geqslant i$ and $B(x, s_{i-1}) \neq B(y, s_{i-1})$. Therefore, $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\hat{u}(x), \hat{u}(y)) = s_i$ by definition.

Finally, let us show that $x < y$ implies $\hat{u}(x) \prec_{alex} \hat{u}(y)$. Since $x \neq y$ we have that $\hat{u}(x) \neq \hat{u}(y)$, so there is an i such that $u(B(x, s_i)) \neq u(B(y, s_i))$, or, equivalently, $B(x, s_i) \neq B(y, s_i)$. Assume that i is the largest such index so that $u(B(x, s_j)) = u(B(y, s_j))$ for all $j > i$. Since $\mathcal{U}$ is an ultrametric space it follows that $B(x, s_i) \cap B(y, s_i) = \varnothing$, whence $B(x, s_i) \prec B(y, s_i)$ by definition of $\prec$. But then $u(B(x, s_i)) \prec u(B(y, s_i))$ because u is an embedding. This, together with $u(B(x, s_j)) = u(B(y, s_j))$ for all $j > i$ yields $\hat{u}(x) \prec_{alex} \hat{u}(y)$.

So, the definition of Φ is correct. We still have to show that this family of maps satisfies the requirement (PA) of Definition 3.1.

Let $\mathcal{U}' = (U', d', <)$ be a linearly ordered metric space that embeds into $\mathcal{U}$ and let $f : \mathcal{U}' \hookrightarrow \mathcal{U}$ be an embedding. Define $v : B_{\mathcal{U}'} \to B_{\mathcal{U}}$ by

$$v(B(x, s_i)) = B(f(x), s_i).$$

Because $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{U}'$ are ultrametric spaces and because f is an embedding it follows immediately that v does not depend on the choice of the center of the ball and that it is injective.

Let us show that v is an embedding $F(\mathcal{U}') \hookrightarrow F(\mathcal{U})$. Assume, first, that $B(x, s_i) \subseteq B(y, s_j)$. Then $s_i \leqslant s_j$ and $d'(x, y) \leqslant s_j$, whence follows immediately that $B(f(x), s_i) \subseteq B(f(y), s_j)$. (If $z \in B(f(x), s_i)$ then $d(z, f(x)) \leqslant s_i$, so $d(z, f(y)) \leqslant \max\{d(z, f(x)), d(f(x), f(y))\} \leqslant s_j$.) Conversely, if $B(f(x), s_i) \subseteq B(f(y), s_j)$ then $s_i \leqslant s_j$ and $d(f(x), f(y)) \leqslant s_j$, whence follows that $B(x, s_i) \subseteq B(y, s_j)$ because f is an embedding.

Assume now that $B(x, s_i) \prec B(y, s_j)$. Then $s_i < s_j$, or $s_i = s_j$ and $x < y$. If $s_i < s_j$ then $B(f(x), s_i) \prec B(f(y), s_j)$ by definition of $\prec$. If, however, $s_i = s_j$ and $x < y$ then $f(x) < f(y)$ and again $B(f(x), s_i) \prec B(f(y), s_j)$ by definition of $\prec$.

Finally, let us show that $\Phi_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{A}}(u) \circ f = \Phi_{\mathcal{U}',\mathcal{A}}(u \circ v)$. Put $\hat{u} = \Phi_{\mathcal{U},\mathcal{A}}(u)$ and $\widehat{u \circ v} = \Phi_{\mathcal{U}',\mathcal{A}}(u \circ v)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{u \circ v}(x) &= \big(u \circ v(B(x, s_0)), u \circ v(B(x, s_1)), \ldots, u \circ v(B(x, s_{k-1}))\big) \\
&= \big(u(B(f(x), s_0)), u(B(f(x), s_1)), \ldots, u(B(f(x), s_{k-1}))\big) \\
&= \hat{u}(f(x)) = \hat{u} \circ f(x).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

As the final demonstration of this strategy we shall show that the class of all finite linearly ordered metric spaces has the Ramsey property.

Let $T = \{0 = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_\ell\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be a finite set of nonnegative reals. We say that T is *tight* if $t_{i+j} \leqslant t_i + t_j$ for all $0 \leqslant i \leqslant j \leqslant i + j \leqslant \ell$.

Lemma 4.3 *Let $(A,+)$ be a subgroup of the additive group $(\mathbb{R},+)$ such that $A \neq \{0\}$. For every finite set $S = \{0 = s_0 < s_1 < \ldots < s_k\} \subseteq A$ there exists a finite tight set $T = \{0 = t_0 < t_1 < \ldots < t_\ell\} \subseteq A$ such that $S \subseteq T$, $t_1 = s_1$ and $t_\ell = s_k$.*

Proof. Let $S = \{0 = s_0 < s_1 < \ldots < s_k\} \subseteq A$ be a finite set. Let us construct a sequence $t_0, t_1, t_2, \ldots$ of reals as follows. Let $t_0 = s_0 = 0$ and $t_1 = s_1$. Assume that we have constructed $t_0, t_1, \ldots, t_i$ and let

$$\{t_0, t_1, \ldots, t_i\} \cap S = \{s_0, s_1, \ldots, s_j\}.$$

If $j = k$ we stop with the construction. If, however, $j < k$ let

$$m_{i+1} = \min\{t_\alpha + t_\beta : \alpha + \beta = i+1, 1 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant \beta\}$$

and

$$t_{i+1} = \begin{cases} s_{j+1}, & s_{j+1} \leqslant m_{i+1}, \\ m_{i+1}, & s_{j+1} > m_{i+1}. \end{cases}$$

Clearly, $\{t_0, t_1, t_2, \ldots\} \subseteq A$, $t_1 = s_1$, and $t_i \leqslant m_i \leqslant t_\alpha + t_\beta$ whenever $\alpha + \beta = i$, $1 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant \beta$.

Next, let us show that $t_{i+1} > t_i$ for all $i \geqslant 0$. We proceed by induction. The first step $t_1 > t_0$ is obvious. Assume that $t_j > t_{j-1}$ for all $j \leqslant i$.

Case 1: $t_{i+1} = m_{i+1}$. Take any α and β such that $\alpha + \beta = i+1$ and $1 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant \beta$. Since $\beta \leqslant i$, by the induction hypothesis we have that $t_\beta > t_{\beta-1}$ whence $t_\alpha + t_\beta > t_\alpha + t_{\beta-1} \geqslant t_{\alpha+\beta-1} = t_i$. Therefore,

$$m_{i+1} = \min\{t_\alpha + t_\beta : \alpha + \beta = i+1, 1 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant \beta\} > t_i.$$

Case 2: $t_{i+1} = s_{j+1}$. If $t_i = s_j$ then $t_{i+1} > t_i$ because $s_{j+1} > s_j$. Assume, therefore, that $t_i \neq s_j$. Then $t_i = m_i < s_{j+1}$ by construction.

Therefore, $t_{i+1} > t_i$ for all $i \geqslant 0$.

Finally, let us show that the procedure stops, whence follows that $t_\ell = s_k$ and that $S \subseteq T$.

By construction $t_1 = s_1$. Assume that $s_j = t_i$ for some j i i and let us show that $s_{j+1} = t_n$ for some $n > i$. Seeking a contradiction, suppose this is not the case. Then, by construction, $t_{i+\beta} = m_{i+\beta} < s_{j+1}$ for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$. Let

$$\delta = \min\{t_\alpha - t_{\alpha-1} : 1 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant i\}.$$

Note that $\delta > 0$ because, as we have just seen, $t_\alpha > t_{\alpha-1}$ for all $\alpha \geqslant 1$. Let us show that $t_{i+1} - t_i \geqslant \delta$. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} t_{i+1} - t_i &= \min\{t_\alpha + t_{i+1-\alpha} : 1 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant i\} - t_i \\ &= \min\{t_\alpha + t_{i+1-\alpha} - t_i : 1 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant i\}. \end{aligned}$$

Having in mind that $t_{i+1-\alpha} \geqslant t_{i-\alpha} + \delta$ and that $t_\alpha + t_{i-\alpha} \geqslant t_i$ we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} t_\alpha + t_{i+1-\alpha} - t_i &\geqslant t_\alpha + t_{i-\alpha} + \delta - t_i \\ &\geqslant t_i + \delta - t_i = \delta, \end{aligned}$$

whence

$$t_{i+1} - t_i = \min\{t_\alpha + t_{i+1-\alpha} - t_i : 1 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant i\} \geqslant \delta.$$

By the same argument we have that $t_{i+2} - t_{i+1} \geqslant \delta$, $t_{i+3} - t_{i+2} \geqslant \delta$, and so on. Therefore, $t_{i+\beta} \geqslant s_j + \beta \cdot \delta$ for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$. This contradicts the assumption that $t_{i+\beta} < s_{j+1}$ for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}$.

Therefore, there is an $n > i$ such that $t_n = s_{j+1}$. Eventually, the procedure stops with $t_\ell = s_k$. □

Theorem 4.4 *[14] (a) The category $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_S$ has the Ramsey property for every finite tight set $S = \{0 = s_0 < s_1 < \ldots < s_k\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$.*

(b) Let $(A, +)$ be a subgroup of the additive group $(\mathbb{R}, +)$ and let I be an arbitrary interval of reals. Then $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_{\{0\}\cup(I\cap A)}$ has the Ramsey property.

(c) The categories $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}$, $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_{\mathbb{Z}}$ have the Ramsey property.

Proof. (a) Let $S = \{0 = s_0 < s_1 < \ldots < s_k\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ be a tight set. In order to show that $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_S$ has the Ramsey property it suffices to establish a pre-adjunction

$$F : \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_S) \rightleftarrows \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}) : G$$

since $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}$ has the Ramsey property (Theorem 3.2).

Take any $k \geqslant 1$. For $\mathcal{M} = (M, d, <) \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_S)$ put

$$F(\mathcal{M}) = (M \times \{0, 1, \ldots, k\}, \sqsubseteq, \prec),$$

where

$$(x, i) \sqsubseteq (y, j) \text{ if and only if } i \leqslant j \text{ and } d(x, y) \leqslant s_j - s_i,$$

and

$$(x, i) \prec (y, j) \text{ if and only if } i < j, \text{ or } i = j \text{ and } x < y.$$

It is obvious that $\sqsubseteq$ is reflexive and transitive, and it is antisymmetric because $(x,i) \sqsubseteq (y,j)$ and $i = j$ imply $x = y$ (since $d(x,y) \leqslant s_j - s_i = 0$). It is also easy to see that $\prec$ extends $\sqsubseteq$: if $(x,i) \sqsubset (y,j)$ then $i < j$ (because $(x,i) \sqsubseteq (y,j)$ and $i = j$ imply $x = y$), whence $(x,i) \prec (y,j)$ by definition. Therefore, $(M \times \{0,1,\ldots,k\}, \sqsubseteq, \prec)$ is a linearly ordered poset and the definition of F is correct.

As in the case of ultrametric spaces, for $\mathcal{A} = (A, \sqsubseteq, \prec) \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}})$ put

$$A^{<k} = \{(a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{k-1}) : a_i \in A, 0 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1\}.$$

Define $d_{\mathcal{A}} : (A^{<k})^2 \to S$ as follows:

$$d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{b}) = s_j$$

where

$$j = \min\{p \in \{0,1,\ldots,k-1\} : (\forall i \leqslant k-1-p)(a_i \sqsubseteq b_{i+p} \wedge b_i \sqsubseteq a_{i+p})\},$$

and $\min \varnothing = k$. Next, put $\overline{a} \prec_{lex} \overline{b}$ if and only if there is a j such that $a_j \prec b_j$ and $(\forall i < j)(a_i = b_i)$. Finally, let

$$G(\mathcal{A}) = (A^{<k}, d_{\mathcal{A}}, \prec_{lex}).$$

Claim. $(A^{<k}, d_{\mathcal{A}}, \prec_{lex})$ is a linearly ordered metric space with distances in S.

Proof. It is clear that $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{b}) \in S$ for all $\overline{a}, \overline{b} \in A^{<k}$ and that $\prec_{lex}$ is a linear ordering of $A^{<k}$. Let us show that $d_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a metric.

Clearly, $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{a}) = s_0 = 0$ and $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{b}) = d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{b}, \overline{a})$ for all $\overline{a}, \overline{b} \in A^{<k}$. Assume that $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{b}) = 0$. Then $(\forall i \leqslant k-1)(a_i \sqsubseteq b_i \wedge b_i \sqsubseteq a_i)$, whence $\overline{a} = \overline{b}$ because $\sqsubseteq$ is antisymmetric.

Finally, let us show that $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{c}) \leqslant d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{b}) + d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{b}, \overline{c})$. Let $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{b}) = s_p$ and $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{b}, \overline{c}) = s_q$. If $p + q \geqslant k$ then $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a}, \overline{c}) \leqslant s_k \leqslant s_p + s_{k-p} \leqslant s_p + s_q$ because S is tight and $k - p \leqslant q \Rightarrow s_{k-p} \leqslant s_q$. Assume, therefore, that $p + q \leqslant k - 1$. Then

$$(\forall i \leqslant k-1-p)(a_i \sqsubseteq b_{i+p} \wedge b_i \sqsubseteq a_{i+p}), \text{ and}$$

$$(\forall i \leqslant k-1-q)(b_i \sqsubseteq c_{i+q} \wedge c_i \sqsubseteq b_{i+q}),$$

whence

$$(\forall i \leqslant k-1-(p+q))(a_i \sqsubseteq c_{i+p+q} \wedge c_i \sqsubseteq a_{i+p+q}).$$

Therefore, $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\overline{a},\overline{c}) \leqslant s_{p+q} \leqslant s_p + s_q$ because S is tight. This completes the proof of the claim.

For $\mathcal{M} = (M, d, <) \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_S)$ and $\mathcal{A} = (A, \sqsubseteq, \prec) \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}})$ let us define

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{M},\mathcal{A}} : \hom_{\overrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}}(F(\mathcal{M}), \mathcal{A}) \to \hom_{\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_S}(\mathcal{M}, G(\mathcal{A}))$$

as follows. For $u : F(\mathcal{M}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ let $\hat{u} = \Phi_{\mathcal{M},\mathcal{A}}(u) : M \to A^{<k}$ be defined by

$$\hat{u}(x) = (u(x,0), u(x,1), \ldots, u(x,k-1)).$$

To show that the definition of Φ is corect we have to show that for every $u : F(\mathcal{M}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ the mapping $\hat{u}$ is an embedding $\mathcal{M} \hookrightarrow G(\mathcal{A})$.

To start with, note that $x < y$ implies $\hat{u}(x) \prec_{lex} \hat{u}(y)$ straightforwardly: $x < y$ implies $(x,0) \prec (y,0)$ in $F(\mathcal{M})$, whence $u(x,0) \prec u(y,0)$ in $\mathcal{A}$, so $\hat{u}(x) \prec_{lex} \hat{u}(y)$. Let us now show that $d(x,y) = d_{\mathcal{A}}(\hat{u}(x), \hat{u}(y))$.

Case 1: $d(x,y) = 0$. Then $\hat{u}(x) = \hat{u}(y)$, so $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\hat{u}(x), \hat{u}(y)) = 0$.

Case 2: $d(x,y) = s_k$. By construction, $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\hat{u}(x), \hat{u}(y)) \leqslant s_k$. Assume that $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\hat{u}(x), \hat{u}(y)) = s_q < s_k$. Then $u(x,0) \sqsubseteq u(y,q)$ in $\mathcal{A}$. Since u is an embedding, it follows that $(x,0) \sqsubseteq (y,q)$ in $F(\mathcal{M})$, whence by definition $d(x,y) \leqslant s_q < s_k$. Contradiction.

Case 3: $d(x,y) = s_p$ where $1 \leqslant p \leqslant k-1$. Then for all i we have that $(x,i) \sqsubseteq (y,i+p)$ and $(y,i) \sqsubseteq (x,i+p)$ in $F(\mathcal{M})$. Consequently, for all i we have that $u(x,i) \sqsubseteq u(y,i+p)$ and $u(y,i) \sqsubseteq u(x,i+p)$ in $\mathcal{A}$. Therefore, $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\hat{u}(x), \hat{u}(y)) \leqslant s_p$. If $d_{\mathcal{A}}(\hat{u}(x), \hat{u}(y)) = s_q < s_p$ we reach a contradiction as in Case 2.

So, the definition of Φ is correct. We still have to show that this family of maps satisfies the requirement (PA) of Definition 3.1.

Let $\mathcal{M}' = (M', d', <)$ be a linearly ordered metric space that embeds into $\mathcal{M}$ and let $f : \mathcal{M}' \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$ be an embedding. Define $v : M' \times \{0, 1, \ldots, k\} \to M \times \{0, 1, \ldots, k\}$ by

$$v(x,i) = (f(x), i).$$

Let us show that v is an embedding $F(\mathcal{M}') \hookrightarrow F(\mathcal{M})$. Clearly, $(x,i) \sqsubseteq (y,j)$ in $F(\mathcal{M}')$ iff $i \leqslant j$ and $d'(x,y) \leqslant s_j - s_i$ iff $i \leqslant j$ and $d(f(x), f(y)) \leqslant s_j - s_i$ iff $(f(x), i) \sqsubseteq (f(y), j)$ in $F(\mathcal{M})$. Assume now that $(x,i) \prec (y,j)$ in $F(\mathcal{M}')$. If $i < j$ then $(f(x), i) \prec (f(y), j)$ in $F(\mathcal{M})$. If, however, $i = j$ then $x < y$, so $f(x) < f(y)$ and again $(f(x), i) \prec (f(y), j)$ in $F(\mathcal{M})$.

Finally, let us show that $\Phi_{\mathcal{M},\mathcal{A}}(u) \circ f = \Phi_{\mathcal{M}',\mathcal{A}}(u \circ v)$. Put $\hat{u} = \Phi_{\mathcal{M},\mathcal{A}}(u)$

and $\widehat{u \circ v} = \Phi_{\mathcal{M}',\mathcal{A}}(u \circ v)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{u \circ v}(x) &= \big(u \circ v(x,0), u \circ v(x,1), \dots, u \circ v(x,k-1)\big)\\ &= \big(u(f(x),0), u(f(x),1), \dots, u(f(x),k-1)\big)\\ &= \hat{u}(f(x)) = \hat{u} \circ f(x).\end{aligned}$$

(b) Let $(A,+)$ be a subgroup of the additive group $(\mathbb{R},+)$ and let I be an arbitrary interval of reals. If $\{0\} \cup (I \cap A) = \{0\}$ the statement is trivially true. Assume, therefore, that $\{0\} \cup (I \cap A) \neq \{0\}$. Then $A \neq \{0\}$. Take any $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_{\{0\}\cup(I\cap A)})$ such that $\mathcal{U} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{V}$, and any $k \geqslant 2$. Since $\mathcal{V}$ is finite, $S = \mathrm{spec}(\mathcal{V})$ is a finite subset of A. By Lemma 4.3 there is a finite tight set $T \subseteq A$ which contains S. Then $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_T)$ because $\mathrm{spec}(\mathcal{U}) \subseteq \mathrm{spec}(\mathcal{V}) = S \subseteq T$. The category $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_T$ has the Ramsey property by (a), so there is a $\mathcal{W} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_T)$ such that $\mathcal{W} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{V})^{\mathcal{U}}_k$.

Since, by construction, the least and the largest nonzero elements of S and T coincide and since $S \subseteq \{0\} \cup (I \cap A)$ it follows that $T \subseteq \{0\} \cup (I \cap A)$, so $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_T$ is a full subcategory of $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}_{\{0\}\cup(I\cap A)}$ whence $\mathcal{W} \in \mathrm{Ob}(\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}})_{\{0\}\cup(I\cap A)}$.

(c) Directly from (b). □

Using much more powerful methods Hubička and Nešetřil have, among many other deep results, described many additional subcategories of $\overrightarrow{\mathbf{M}}$ that have the Ramsey property, see [6] for details.

References

[1] F. G. Abramson, L. A. Harrington. Models without indiscernibles. J. Symbolic Logic 43 (1978), 572–600.

[2] J. Adamek, H. Herrlich, G. E. Strecker. Abstract and Concrete Categories: The Joy of Cats. Dover Books on Mathematics, Dover Publications 2009

[3] R. Börger, W. Tholen. Abschwächungen des Adjunktionsbegriffs. Manuscripta Mathematica 19 (1976), 19–45.

[4] R. L. Graham, K. Leeb, B. L. Rothschild. Ramsey's theorem for a class of categories. Advances in Math. 8 (1972) 417–443; errata 10 (1973) 326–327

[5] R. L. Graham, B. L. Rothschild. Ramsey's theorem for n-parameter sets. Tran. Amer. Math. Soc. 159 (1971), 257–292.

[6] J. Hubička, J. Nešetřil. All those Ramsey classes (Ramsey classes with closures and forbidden homomorphisms). Preprint, arXiv:1606.07979v1

[7] A. S. Kechris, V. G. Pestov, S. Todorčević. Fraïssé limits, Ramsey theory and topological dynamics of automorphism groups. GAFA Geometric and Functional Analysis, 15 (2005) 106–189.

[8] A. Kechris, M. Sokić. Dynamical properties of the automorphism groups of the random poset and random distributive lattice. Fund. Math. 218 (2012), 69–94.

[9] K. Leeb. The categories of combinatorics. Combinatorial structures and their applications. Gordon and Breach, New York (1970).

[10] D. Mašulović, L. Scow. Categorical Constructions and Ramsey Property. Preprint, arXiv:1506.01221

[11] M. Müller, A. Pongrácz. Topological Dynamics of unordered Ramsey structures. Preprint, arXiv:1401.7766v2

[12] J. Nešetřil. Ramsey theory. In: R. L. Graham, M. Grötschel and L. Lovász, eds, Handbook of Combinatorics, Vol. 2, 1331–1403, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 1995.

[13] J. Nešetřil. Ramsey classes and homogeneous structures. Combinatorics, probability and computing, 14 (2005) 171–189.

[14] J. Nešetřil. Metric spaces are Ramsey. European Journal of Combinatorics 28 (2007), 457–468.

[15] J. Nešetřil, V. Rödl. Partitions of finite relational and set systems. J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 22 (1977), 289–312.

[16] J. Nešetřil, V. Rödl. Combinatorial partitions of finite posets and lattices – Ramsey lattices. Algebra Universalis 19 (1984), 106–119.

[17] H. J. Prömel. Ramsey Theory for Discrete Structures. Springer (2013).

[18] H. J. Prömel, B. Voigt. Recent results in partition (Ramsey) theory for finite lattices. Discr. Math. 35 (1981), 185–198.

[19] H. J. Prömel, B. Voigt. Partition theorems for parameter systems and graphs. Discrete Math. 36 (1981), 83–96.

[20] L. Nguyen Van Thé. Structural Ramsey theory of metric spaces and topological dynamics of isometry groups. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, Vol. 206 (2010), No. 968

[21] L. Nguyen Van Thé. More on the Kechris-Pestov-Todorcevic correspondence: precompact expansions. Fund. Math. 222 (2013), 19–47

[22] A. Wiweger. Pre-adjunctions and lambda-algebraic theories. Colloquium Mathematicum 48 (1984), 153–165

[23] A. Zucker. Topological dynamics of automorphism groups, ultrafilter combinatorics, and the Generic Point Problem. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 368 (2016), 6715–6740